

MUST MURDERED FIRST

MUST MURDERERS ESCAPE?

IS THE COURT OF OYER AND TERMINER A LEGAL COURT?

Has the Repeal of Existing Laws by the City Charter of 1870 Nullified the Action of the Court of Oyer and Terminer?—The Case as Stated by Judge Ingraham.

In the case of William O'Kell agt. The People, Judge Ingraham, in the following words, states the facts:

On the 11th day of June, 1858, the Court of the Supreme Court, made the following decision as to the capacity of the Court of Oyer and Terminer of this district:

By the original charter of New York, the Mayor, Recorder, and Aldermen were made Justices as well as the Judges of the Court of Oyer and Terminer. An act passed in 1847, chapter 283, section 20, provided that the Mayor, Recorder, and Aldermen should be Justices of the Court of Oyer and Terminer of the county of New York should be competent to sit with the Judges of the Supreme Court and any two of the Judges of the Court of Common Pleas, the Mayor, Recorder, and Aldermen.

By the act entitled "An act further to amend the charter of the city," passed April 11, 1853, section 6, it was provided that the Aldermen should be competent to sit or act as Judge in the Court of Oyer and Terminer.

By an act supplementary to the last cited act, passed June 14, 1853, section 3, it was provided that the Justices of the Court of Oyer and Terminer, or said court, may be held by a Justice of the Supreme Court, and that all the powers and jurisdiction pertaining by law to such Courts may be exercised and exercised by such Judge.

In the act to amend the Charter passed April 14, 1857, the same provisions were repeated, that no Alderman should sit or act as Judge of the Oyer and Terminer, and that Courts of such name should be

The city and county of New York might be held by a Justice of the Supreme Court, Section 43.

All the facts above cited are by their own force included by the 120th section of the act to reorganize the local government of the city of New York, passed April 5, 1870, except the Act passed in 1871.

The repeal of these statutes designating what Judge should hold the Order and Terminus in New York is relied on in behalf of the prisoner, as showing that the court was not properly organized when the prisoner was tried, and, therefore, that the conviction was illegal.

The word *repeal* is to be used in a limited sense, and not to be taken as absolute, if it appeared on the

In this case the whole scope of the act was to provide for the local government of New York. Nothing was in fact on the subject of the Courts, nor providing for their organization. There is nothing in the whole act which relates to any other subject than the government of the city. It is clear that the words of this reproduction are sufficient if construed literally, to repeal the whole of these statutes.

But there are considerations connected with the subject matter of the repealing act that will justify a different conclusion. It does not follow because

The proper construction of this repelling clause is, that it was intended to repeal only so much of the city charter as was inconsistent with or relating to the government of the city as there provided for. There is another view of this question which seems to me to be entitled to much weight in its decision.

Statutes should be so constrains to give effect to every part; and where one interpretation of any part of it would nullify another part, the latter part should be rejected.

that one would give effect to the whole, the latter should prevail.

This act which contains the repeal is a local act; the repealing clause is to affect a State Court organized under the Constitution and is not local. If the repeal is construed as affecting the whole of the act, and not merely the clause relating to the Court of Oyer and Terminer, it would have the effect of repealing the whole of the act which relates to local matters (see *People v. McGinnis*, 115 N. Y. 136; *People v. Supervisors*, 1882, 32 N. Y. 136). If the repeal is limited to the matters connected with the city government, the whole act can stand. Whereof must be the effect. It is the latter which is fully given in thus limiting the effect of the re-

It is contended that the Constitution, which declares that a justice of the Supreme Court may reside in Canada or elsewhere, does not prohibit the Legislature from adding other judges to that Court. See section 8 of the constitution. Admitting that to be the proper construction of the word "preside" as used in that declaration would be necessary to provide such for the judges. (People vs. Mayor, &c. 25 Wend. 32.) The only provision which is made in the

other judges who should sit in *Oyer and Term*, is that the repeal of the various acts authorizing the Court to be held by the Justices of the Superior Court, and the provision of the Revised Statutes, and the act of 1847, which designated other judges for that purpose.

The answer to that is, that the act of 1847, as well as the provision of the Revised Statutes on that subject, designating judges to hold the Court, were repealed long before the statutes above referred to, and there is now no law providing for such judges as the Court be required.

The 13th section of the Code of Procedure, as used in 1848, is as follows: "All statutes con-

in providing for the designation of the times and place of holding the terms of the Supreme Court, the Circuit Courts, and Courts of Oyer and Terminer, of the Judges who shall hold the same are repealed from and after the first day of July, 1858, and the 221 section of the Code authorized, authorized, or to designate the Judges by whom such Courts shall be held, up to the year 1859.

There is, therefore, no statute now in force which designates any person to sit as a Judge of the Oyer and Terminer, or of the Supreme Court to preside at the trial of the prisoner, and the Court is therefore authorized to render its decision against the plea of the prisoner, and the organization of the Court of Oyer and Terminer at the place the prisoner was tried, and without further action of the Court which would be necessary to have

properly organized it there had been any judge
dging the Court other than a Justice of the Su-
preme Court.
No error was committed on the trial, and the
verdict should be affirmed.

HARRY HILL'S FIELD DAY.

am Hurst, the Heaviest of the Heavy
Weights—Jem Mace's Challenge—High
Old Time for the Boys Generally.
Yesterday afternoon at Harry Hill's there

A grand exhibition of sparring, Harry Hill stepped on the stage, leading Sam, at first it was thought to be a man. Harry looked up, and saw a woman, and said, "Gentlemen, I have the honor to introduce to you Sam, an ex-champion of England, who arrived from Vermont yesterday."

They then retired before the sports had time to cover from their assignment. Mr. Hurler, who weighed two inches in height, and weighs 2-1/2 pounds, made over the championship from Hill, since which time Sam has not appeared in the ring. He told the St. V. reporter that he had no intention of entering the ring, but merely comes the At-

During the entertainment Harry Hill introduced Mr. Mace. "He will light my pipe in three minutes," said Harry. "You see, it is particularly anxious to recognize the Irish giant, O'Ballwin." The clapping of applause followed this announcement and there were loud cries for Mr. Mace. The clamping of the first weights tripped on the stage, and said:

"I have often stated that I had retired from the ring, but as Mr. O'Ballwin was in the East, I could not do so. I am ready for him." The result of my late meeting with Mr. Coburn was not at all satisfactory, and I deem to end my fighting career. I am ready to do anything, but I am ready at this moment to make

PHILADELPHIA, Jan. 18.—Jay Cooke has published a card in which he says that the joint proposition made by his house and that of the Rothschilds to take \$600,000 of the new loan was made in entire good faith, and the persons interested are ready to carry out promptly the negotiation as soon

As the Secretary of the Treasury is able to comply with its terms, and said, conclude to accept the proposition. The proposed bill is to take \$5,000,000 of the new five per cent loan on or before the 1st of February next, with the option of \$500,000 more during the year, and should Congress accede to the secretary's recommendation and make the interest payable in London, then to have an additional \$2,000,000 of the five, and \$500,000 of the four and a half, on or before the 1st of June of 1873. The negotiation is, with these terms of agreement, to make the interest payable in London, and on the precise terms is to the Treasury and made by the United States Commissioner, as was granted in the

\$1,000,000 annually. Joe C. Wilson, president of the Congress, says 10 to 15 million dollars will be needed to make the project payable in London. Two or six hundred millions can be borrowed at present and half and have per cent at the present rate, but would be a senior with what has already been done, will save nearly \$1,000,000 per annum to the Treasury.

Nominated for United States Senate.
 ALEXANDER, Jan. 18.—At the Democratic caucus to elect the Hon. George R. Davis, present State Senator from Somerset county, was nominated for the United States Senate, to succeed the Hon. G.

Westward Ho!
Harrisburg, Pa., Jan. 14. — William M. Tweed
passed here ~~quite~~ ~~well~~ ~~last~~ ~~evening~~.